SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology**
Manuscript Number:	**2013_AJAEES_5789**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Consumers' Perception of Safety of Leafy Vegetables and Its Effect on Their Vegetable Purchasing Decisions in the Kumasi Metropolis of Ghana**
Type of the Article	**Research paper**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Abstract**: Well written **Keywords**: I9dentify other keywords to widen the journal and net searches. Current keywords are from the title. For example keywords such as pesticides, risk, retail markets can be used **Introduction**: See reference section **Literature Review**: 2.3, para 2, line 94-95. The statement 'Consumers will avoid purchasing leafy vegetables that are perceived as unsafe'. Is this based on Yeung and Morris (2001) or authors' results? It is also irrelevant to Yeung and Morris (2001) since their study focused on chicken meat. **Method**: Why 200 respondents? Is the sample representative of Kumasi region? Kumasi has a population of 2 million people. The small sample size must be discussed in the limitation and the authors are advised not to make generalised to whole of Ghana. Questionnaire development should be discussed in Methodology section How many parts were there in the questionnaire? What kind of questions were asked? Questionnaire should be provided in the Appendix or advised within text that the questionnaire will be provided by author is requested. Were the questionnaires pilot-tested? If yes, how many?	

	If no, how did the authors verify the validity of the questions? What is the Cronbach alpha number (to measure reliability) of the questionnaire? Sampling: There may be sampling bias within the methodology since only the major or biggest retail markets were chosen. What about the population that visit other grocery stores, travelling vendors, small markets, night market, weekend markets, green grocers, farms, etc? What about populations that do not have access to big retail markets? Also retail markets may have stricter purchasing standards compared to small markets, and produce may have to meet certain quality requirements before they can be sold at the big retailers. Did the authors look at the various retail markets' safety and quality requirements? **Results and discussion** Demographics should be shown to readers first to set the scene for this section. Line 197 – 201 should also be brought to the first part of Results and discussion. How do the author(s) define safety in this study? Is safety and quality the same? Why are the attributes such as bruised, rot and decay being used? Are these products considered unsafe or of lower quality. The mixed up terms, especially to represent safety and quality will greatly undermine the study. In survey studies, Likert scale scores are not usually averaged. In this case, mode are preferred compared to mean average. For example, the usage of average score of 2.53 (line 144). What is the meaning of 2.53? It's an average score between agree and neutral which has no meaning. On the other hand, if mode is reported (such as	

	your percentage) and discussed, readers will be able to comprehend better. It is also important to note that the mean score between different respondents will differ. For example, the level of strongly agree of one respondent will differ from another. Significance difference can be reported as significance level of $p < 0.01$ etc or 99% confidence level, instead of 10%, 5% or 1% as reported in this study. Cross tabulation section should be re-written to ensure clarity. At present, it is unclear and very difficult to follow. **Limitation**: Include limitation section to state that the samples are not representative of Kumasi region and Ghana. **Conclusion**: A sweeping statement at line 230-231 'Consumers are of the view that leafy vegetables produced in Ghana are not safe' should only be made with sufficient, valid and representative data. **References**: Use more up to date references. For example year 2005 onwards. - Missing references such as Gregory 2000; Cox et al. (Missing year), - Cite your reference under Introduction, para 3, line 41 – 47. Regarding the statement 'Also, vegetables on the retail market... to increasing health risk to consumers' Is this statement based on a reference or authors' own observation? - Cite reference for 2. Literature review, para. 4 line 73 – 75. - Reference list all jumbled up. Please follow the journal's author guidelines. - Formatting of citation in text not according to	

	journal's guideline. For example, Cofie et al. 2003 and Yiridoe et al. 2005. Both references are made up of 3 authors; hence the question should it be cited as et al. or all three authors named? **Overall comment:** Author(s) should also discuss the relevance of the study to Asian leafy green industries and to the readers of Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics and Sociology. Major revision needed for manuscript. If questionnaires were not pilot-tested or validated, I will advise that pilot-testing of the questionnaire, reliability test and sampling of respondents to be carried out again. Alternatively, authors should discuss their limitations of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Note: Anonymous Reviewer